ATTACHMENT F:

Indicator 9 Table: Aggregated from Massachusetts 2005 SPP data.

Indicator 9:

	# of findings of noncompliance	# of corrections within one year	Percent corrected
A. Monitoring Priorities	5	5	
B. Other	6	6	
C. Other mechanisms	1	1	
	12	12	100%

Table for #9A

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C						
Indicator	Measurement Calculation	Explanation				
 General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. 	See attached Calculation Chart for specifications of data included here	A data review was conducted for all 61 programs in FY 2005.				
A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:		Four programs were selected for Focused Monitoring Onsite visit.				
 a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators. b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. Percent = b divided by a times 100. 	$a = 5$ $b = 5$ $b/a - 5/5 = 1 \times 100 = 100\%$	All 61 programs completed an Annual Report/Self-Assessment. One program had a Written Parental Complaint filed.				

Compilation Table

Indicator	Monitoring Method	# Reviewed	# with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 yr	% Corrected w/in 1 yr
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely	Annual Report/Self- Assessment	NA				NA
manner	Onsite FM visit	4	2	2	2	100%
	Data Review	NA				NA

Indicator	Monitoring Method	# Reviewed	# with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 yr	% Corrected w/in 1 yr
	Other:	NA				NA
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who	Self-Review	NA				NA
primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.	Onsite Visit	NA				NA
(DPH utilizes the EHS data system to publicly report	Data Review/EIIS Survey	61	NA			NA
on this Indicator. However it is not used to identify areas of noncompliance given the state average is 98.8%)	Other:	NA				NA
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who	Self-Review					
demonstrate improved: positive social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills; use of	Onsite Visit					
appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. NEW INDICATOR NO DATA 2004-05	Data Review					
NEW INDICATOR NO DATA 2004-03	Other:					
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report	Self-Review					
that early intervention services helped the family: know their rights; effectively communicate their children's needs; and help their children develop and learn.	Onsite Visit					
	Data Review					
NEW INDICATOR NO DATA 2004-05	Other:					
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Self-Review	NA				NA
(DPH utilized the EHS data system to publicly report	On-site Visit	NA				NA
on this Indicator; however it is not used to identify areas of noncompliance. All EIPs are above the	Data Review/EIIS	61	NA			NA
national average of .98 %.)	Other:	NA				NA
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs.	Self-Review	NA				NA
(DPH utilized the EIIS data system to publicly report	Onsite Visit	NA				NA
on this Indicator; however it is not used to identify	Data Review/EIIS	61				NA
areas of noncompliance. All EIPs are above the national average of 2.4%)	Other:	NA				NA
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for	Self-Review	NA				NA
whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP	Onsite Visit	NA				NA

Indicator	Monitoring Method	# Reviewed	# with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 yr	% Corrected w/in 1 yr
meeting were conducted within Part C's 45 day timeline. (In FY2005 EIIS/Contract Performance data was not	Data Review/EIIS/Contract Performance Review	61	NA			NA
utilized to identify areas of noncompliance; however it was used to identify programs for targeted technical assistance. This data is now being used to identify noncompliance for FY 2006 and for Local Determinations)	Other:	NA				NA
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received	Annual Report/Self- Assessment	61				NA
timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by	Onsite FM visit	4	2	3	3	100%
their third birthday.	Data Review/EIIS	61	NA			NA
(EIIS captures complete and comprehensive transition plans and number of referrals at discharged which is used as a data source for selection of FM onsite visits.)	Other:	NA				NA
TOTALS	SUM COLUMNS A AND B			5	5	

Table for #9B

Monitoring Priority: Effe	ctive General Supervision Part	С
Indicator	Measurement Calculation	Explanation
 9. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. B. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification: 		There were six findings of noncompliance made in 2 areas not included in 9A: 1. IFSP Development - timely assignment of Service Coordinator (1) - written notification of IFSP meeting (1) - complete and individualized IFSPs (1)
 a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to such areas. b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. Percent = b divided by a times 100.	a = 6 b = 6 b/a = 100%	2. Family Rights/Due Process - parental consent for change in IFSP services (1) - full explanation of Rights & Procedures (1) - signed release of information present in child's record. (1)

Table for Indicator #9C

Monitoring Priority: Effect	ctive General Supervision	Part C			
Indicator	Measurement Calculation	Explanation			
General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.		One agency had a written family complaint related to timely service provision – IFSP services not being			
C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:		consistently provided. Corrective Action Plan was completed and all IFSP services were provided. Compensatory services			
 a. # of agencies in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms. 	a = 1	were accepted by the family.			
b. # of findings of noncompliance made.	b = 1				
 c. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. 	c = 1				
Percent = c divided by b times 100.	c/b =1/1 = 1 x 100 = 100%				